



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

conditions of probation and shall instruct him regarding the same. Such officer shall keep informed concerning the conduct and condition of each person on probation under his supervision and shall report thereon at least monthly to the court placing such person on probation. Such officer shall use all suitable methods, not inconsistent with the conditions imposed by the court, to aid persons on probation and to bring about improvement in their conduct and condition. Such officer shall keep records of his work; shall keep accurate and complete accounts of all moneys collected from persons under his supervision, shall give receipts therefor, and shall make at least monthly returns thereof; shall make such reports to the Attorney General as he may at any time require; and shall perform such other duties as the court may direct. A probation officer shall have such power of arrest as is now exercised by a deputy marshal.

Sec. 4. That this Act shall take effect immediately.

PENOLOGY

Women Offenders and Offenses in Chicago.—Fifty per cent of the women whose cases form the basis of the report of social service work in the Women's Department, Chicago House of Correction, September 1, 1917, to March 1, 1919, were committed to the House of Correction under the Disorderly Conduct Ordinance, known as 2012. While a 2012 charge may represent, and is generally looked upon as a "petty offense," due to the elasticity of the ordinance, it may be made to embrace anything from the smallest misdemeanor up to a penitentiary offense, and the punishment may be a \$5.00 fine, or it may be \$206.50. The total number of women included in the study is 130.

In studying the 2012 offenders, we find that the group is made up of almost an equal number of young first commitments and old offenders—the types that present the most hopeful and the least hopeful possibilities, and the very ones that should not be found in the House of Correction at all.

The old alcoholics and drug addicts, coming each time before a different judge, are repeatedly sent to the House of Correction on a 2012 charge with a fine of \$5.00 and \$10.00 costs, when, if given the maximum sentence, they would at least be given the best opportunity that exists under present legal provision to be kept a longer time, and to get the poisons out of their systems and build up their physical strength.

The young first commitments sent to the House of Correction on a 2012 charge are classed with the old offenders, when an investigation preceding trial would have resulted, in many cases, in probation or release.

Great care and caution is used by the court in the treatment of the girl up to eighteen years, but as soon as she gets beyond this age she is open to the same treatment as the old offender, unless some one is present to urge probation or unless the judge suggests investigation and probation, neither of which is the case in many instances. Why should not the juvenile-adult girl offender be recognized and given the same consideration as the juvenile-adult boy offender?

That certain conditions prevail is not entirely the fault of the judge sentencing the women. First, there is an absence of proper institutions for their care. Second, the frequent shifting of judges from one court to another gives no one judge an opportunity of recognizing repeaters, or opportunity

for studying underlying causes or needs; also, the absence of proper investigation or information before the judge at the time of trial makes it necessary for him to deal with an offender on the basis of the charge only.

Here again, we might emphasize the need of a Central Detention Home for women with a Woman's Court in connection. The Social Service Department in connection with such institutions would have the social, mental and physical history and previous record prepared for the court when the woman came to trial and her case could be disposed of with discrimination and intelligence, and not in the ineffective and unscientific manner now prevailing.

Larcenies: The larceny group, which comprises 25.2 per cent of the 484 cases reported on, presents a most difficult problem. As an adult correctional group they have been the least studied and observed, either from a psychopathic or sociological standpoint. They are difficult to place in employment, difficult of approach and hard to understand.

Five distinct types have come under our observation: The chronic thief, termed a "kleptomaniac," who has an innate desire to steal; the type whose moral strength has been impaired through the use of liquor or drugs, and who steals from habit; the girl who gets into bad company for the first time, and finding the way open and easy, takes a silk waist or silk stockings; the young woman whose earnings are insufficient to meet her desires, and who takes a fur, a muff, or a pair of slippers, and, lastly, the type whose motive cannot be explained—the young woman of good mentality, in comfortable circumstances, with a providing husband and one or more children, who makes a chance trip downtown and steals a waist or skirt for which she has no immediate need.

When the disposition to steal is traceable to the use of liquor or drugs, defective mentality, or bad company, there is a possibility of rehabilitation in removing the cause or the occasion, but the last mentioned type, whose motive for stealing cannot be analyzed or explained, is altogether baffling and discouraging.

The following cases may serve to illustrate this type:

M. W.—White. Age 24. Married before. Husband age 27. Earning \$22.00 a week.

One child, age 3. Pregnant 2 months.

Mentality good. Attended school in Warsaw to age of 15.

Quiet temperament.

Took fancy underwear from department store.

Fine \$31.50. Sentence 4 months.

Served sentence at House of Correction 3 years ago for same offense.

No other arrest or trouble.

S. H.—White. Age 22. Husband age 22. Earning \$17.00-\$30.00 a week.

No children.

Mentality fair. Attended school in Poland to age of 14.

Quiet temperament.

Stole house slippers from department store.

Fine \$7.50. Sentence 60 days.

No previous arrest.

B. W.—White. Age 29. Husband 31. Earning \$100.00 a month.

One child 9, baby 3 weeks.

Mentality average. Attended country school to age of 12.

Stole two waists and skirt from department store.

Fine \$7.50. Sentence 30 days.

Arrested on same charge one year ago and placed on probation.

An intensive, scientific study of larceny cases would be illuminating and helpful to all who are engaged in correctional work, and would, no doubt, reveal a method of treatment other than fines or short sentences. The records of the Department could contribute much valuable information to such a study.

Contributing to the Delinquency or Dependency of Children: This represents the third largest group, and as stated elsewhere in this report, usually has the interest or attention of the Juvenile Court or Juvenile Protective Association before and after commitment to the House of Correction.

Moral Offenses: Keeping a disorderly house, inmates of disorderly house, and soliciting, represent a small percentage of this group; perhaps, due to the fact that most offenses involving morals are committed from the Morals Court, also for the reason that these offenders are often sentenced under a 2012 charge. As mentioned before, all Morals Court cases are looked after by the social worker from this court. Few of these women ask or want assistance of any kind. Occasionally the younger women will ask to have employment found for them, but are generally transferred to Lawndale Hospital, and we do not hear from them again.

Disposition of Cases: As is generally known, the methods used in disposing of offenders are: a fine, a sentence, or a sentence and fine. Of the 484 offenders discussed in this report, 296, or 61.1 per cent, were given a fine, 53 a sentence; 131 a fine and sentence; 4 were emergency cases.

The present system has been one of the greatest impediments to success in working out a constructive plan for many of the House of Correction women. The law stipulates nothing and requires nothing of the person paying the fine, except that he have the necessary amount. There is no authority granted or provision made to investigate the character, responsibility, or motive of the person paying the fine, and there is no way, except by accident, of finding out on what condition the woman has secured her release, or where she has gone.

The time, effort and possibilities lost in making a plan to assist a woman and then have her unexpectedly released under these circumstances, are small considerations when contrasted with the possibilities for evil under such a system. We could cite dozens of instances where girls or women were, through the payment of fines, forced back, many times against their wishes, to evil companions, worthless men, unhappy homes, or lives of crime, or trace of them lost entirely.

Fines may have a value as a deterrent from law-breaking, but they contribute nothing to reform, and are not seriously considered as a reform measure. Perhaps the "speeder," the "scraper," or the petty offender may "stop, look and listen" next time as a result of a fine, but morals or mental defects can never be changed by imposing a fine. Fining the thief, or the prostitute, most often means forcing them back to the old occupation all the more quickly to earn the fine, which, probably, because being a member of a gang or profession, is usually paid.

The attitude toward the law of the person who serves time because of poverty is too obvious to need lengthy comment. Yet, one-half of these serving sentences at the House of Correction, are there for the non-payment of fines. Regarding this, the City Council Committee on Crime (1915) p. 43, says:

"That this system which virtually sends men to jail because of their poverty is not only unjust but demoralizing to the individual and costly to the state is now becoming widely recognized. In many places the more enlightened system has been adopted of suspending sentence and sending the man back to his family and his 'job,' and allowing him to pay his fine in small installments. This installment-fine system was adopted in Massachusetts in 1909, and has been more widely used each year in that state. It is also used at the present time in New York, in Indianapolis, in Kansas City and in Cleveland. Chicago would not be making a hazardous experiment if she released the 85 per cent of offenders in the House of Correction who are there for the non-payment of fines to go back to work under the supervision of probation officers."—From Bulletin of the Department of Public Welfare, Chicago, Vol. II, No. 5. Louise Osborne Rowe, Commissioner.

The Report on Prisons of New Zealand for the Year 1918-19, Also Operations of the First Offenders Probation Act, 1908, p. 32, Thomas M. Wilford, Minister in Charge of Prisons Department, Wellington, New Zealand; The Report of the Prisons Department of the Prisons Board for 1918, p. 4, Robert Stout, President, Wellington, New Zealand.—It is interesting to note that in 1918 in New Zealand there was a marked decrease in the number of persons sentenced to civil imprisonment in New Zealand. The decrease was far less proportionately than in Great Britain. Whether it was a result of the smaller number of persons sentenced or not the report does not state, but there was a considerable reduction in the number of short sentences imposed and a substantial increase in the number of persons sentenced to twelve months and upwards.

The number of military offenders serving terms of imprisonment in the civil prisons reached the highest total during the war. These offenders were kept separate from "the criminal class" and employed in useful reproductive work. The presence of agitators in two of the prisons led to a policy of passive resistance on the part of the military offenders in those prisons and made considerable trouble. The report recommends that military offenders should be confined in places entirely outside the jurisdiction of the prisons department.

The gross expenditure of the department (12 prisons and some minor gaols) were £95,324. The cash and financial credits earned by the department were £21,654. These were for farm produce, farm stock, bricks, boots, prison labor on the new rifle range, etc. There was an additional amount of prison labor for which cash credits were not earned. This was £19,823, making the net cost of the prisons department to the state £42,270. The report claims that every able-bodied prisoner is as fully employed as "our system can compel him to be."

Under the Prisoners Detention Act of 1915, nineteen prisoners have been